

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DARREN HARCUM,	:	CIVIL NO. 3:06-CV-02136
JOSE ORTIZ,	:	
KYLE COLLINS,	:	(Judge Conaboy)
MIGUEL SOTO,	:	
ZACHARY DOONEY and	:	(Magistrate Judge Smyser)
RODELL SURRATT,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
EDWARD KLEM, CHMIELEWSKI,	:	
VANCE, J.D. DUDECK, GEISINGER,	:	
HOFFMAN, BRONSBURG, TEMPERINE,	:	
DONALD JONES, WILLIAM WETZEL,	:	
VUKSTA, E. MARTIN,	:	
THOMAS DERFLER, SERVIN,	:	
STEVEN DATCHKO, WYNDER,	:	
CHAPMAN, MASON, YOURAN, CLARK,	:	
ADAMS, DELBASO, SROMORSKI,	:	
GEORGE CLEMENTS, BECKY DESANTI,	:	
CYNTHIA GREGORY, ROBERT BITNER,	:	
GERALD GAVIN and JOHN DOE,	:	
	:	
Defendants	:	

ORDER

On October 31, 2006, the plaintiffs, ten state prisoners proceeding *pro se*, commenced this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action by filing a complaint. The plaintiffs' claims concern events and conditions at the State Correctional Institution at

Mahanoy (SCI-Mahanoy). The complaint names as defendants thirty Department of Corrections and SCI-Mahanoy officials and employees.

Numerous claims have been dismissed. The remaining claims in this case are the plaintiffs' equal protection claims regarding the discipline they received in connection with a July 25, 2006 incident, plaintiff Surratt's claims regarding being assaulted and being denied the opportunity to file criminal charges against his attacker, plaintiff Surratt's claim regarding defendant Dudeck discarding mail, and plaintiff Harcum's claims regarding being denied use of an inhaler for his asthma.

Mail sent by the court to plaintiffs Dooney and Collins has been returned to the court as undeliverable.¹

¹ We note that one order sent to plaintiff Surratt was returned to the court as undeliverable. However, that order was subsequently remailed to plaintiff Surratt and was not returned to the court.

Local Rule 83.18, Rules of Court, M.D. Pa., requires a *pro se* litigant to maintain his or her current address with the Clerk of Court. By a standard practice order filed on October 31, 2006, the plaintiffs were informed of their obligation to keep the court informed of their current addresses.

It appears that plaintiffs Dooney and Collins have failed to inform the court of their new addresses. We will direct these plaintiffs to show cause why they should not be dismissed from this case.

IT IS ORDERED that, on or before June 9, 2008, plaintiffs Dooney and Collins shall show cause why they should not be dismissed from this case based on their failure to keep the court informed of their current addresses.

/s/ J. Andrew Smyser

J. Andrew Smyser
Magistrate Judge

Dated: May 9, 2008.